



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *107<sup>th</sup>* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2002

## *Senate*

### **NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001**

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, for 2 weeks we have debated the comprehensive energy policy we should have for this country. Most Members and most Americans agree we need to do two basic things: One, we need to create more energy; two, we need to conserve more energy.

Throughout the legislation we are debating, there are a variety of ways we will create more energy: make natural gas more readily accessible from northern Alaska; create renewable energy; more solar, wind, geothermal; interesting exploitation of biomass, biofuels, soy diesel, among others.

On the conservation side, we are not doing so well. On the conservation side, we need to do a whole lot better. The Senator from Massachusetts has alluded to how much oil we consume. We consume a whole lot, given the size and population of our country, compared to the rest of the world. Our oil imports account for roughly 60 percent of the oil we consume. That is up from 30 percent when I came back to the United States at the end of the Vietnam war.

By the mid-1970s, we did not have much of a trade deficit. Today we have a trade deficit of \$300 billion a year. A good deal of that is oil. Roughly a little more than half of the oil we consume, we consume with cars, trucks, and vans we drive. To pass from the Senate and send to conference with the House energy legislation that does not make meaningful, measurable steps toward reducing the amount of oil we use for our

cars, trucks, and vans is shortsighted and a mistake.

A month ago I had an opportunity to participate in a meeting convened by our majority leader, Senator Daschle. At that meeting were Senator Levin, Senator Stabenow, Senator Kerry, Senator Carnahan, myself, and others. We were at the behest of our majority leader to see if we might try to find middle ground between the approach Senator Kerry wanted to take on CAFE standards and the approach of Senator Levin.

I thought on that day and today I still believe there is a compromise, and a good compromise, between what each proposed then and what each proposes to do today. At that early meeting I laid out what I thought were five principles that should underlie any changes we make with respect to the fuel efficiency of our cars, trucks, and vans. I mention those again. Senator Mikulski alluded to them yesterday. No. 1, we need to reduce oil imports. That should be an embodied principle. No. 2, we should set clear, measurable objectives. No. 3, we should do our dead-level best to preserve American jobs. No. 4, we should provide reasonable leadtime to the auto industry for any changes that are going to be coming. No. 5, we need to think out the box. We need to be innovative.

I have never been a big one for micromanaging. I urged Senator Kerry in his legislation to move away from the idea that the Congress would set these interim goals for fuel efficiency. It is appropriate for

Congress and the Senate to set longtime goals for fuel efficiency, be it CAFE or a reduction, a measurable, tangible reduction in oil imports. I am not as comfortable for the Congress setting interim goals. I would have that delegated to an appropriate entity.

Earlier today we debated the Levin amendment, for which I voted. I would like to be able to vote for the Kerry amendment not because I thought Levin was perfect, but there are a lot of elements that are good. Not because I think Kerry-McCain is perfect, but there is a lot that is good. If you put it together, we would have a good package.

I mention a couple aspects of the Levin amendment that I think are helpful and ought to be in the final package that hopefully will go to the President for his signature. The Levin amendment focuses on three or four major things that the Government ought to do and can do well. One is significant investments of Federal dollars in research and development, for fuel cells, for hybrid technology, including diesel hybrid technology.

The Levin amendment acknowledges there is a responsibility, and a good opportunity, a responsibility for the Federal Government to help commercialize the new technologies in fuel efficiency, vehicle efficiency that are coming along. The Federal Government has the opportunity to use its purchasing power to buy large numbers of cars, trucks, vans, jeeps, SUVs, trucks, semitrucks, others that are more fuel efficient. We should do that in the military and on the civilian side and use our purchasing power to help commercialize the new technologies.

Another role for the Federal Government is with respect to tax policy. If we want producers of vehicles to produce more fuel-efficient vehicles, we need to include a tax incentive. The Levin approach provides that.

Similarly, if we want to make sure the vehicles that are energy efficient are

purchased by consumers, we need to provide incentives for consumers to buy. We do that under the Levin approach.

The one element that is missing in the approach of Senators LEVIN and BOND is the biggest hole in the amendment: We do not set a clear, measurable objective. We can argue until the cows come home about whether or not we need to change CAFE, concerns of foreign and domestic production, are we fearful of exporting the building of small cars to other countries if we approach this the wrong way.

Maybe the debate should not be about CAFE at all. Maybe the clear, measurable objective we ought to debate is an objective that reduces oil imports, reduces the consumption of oil by our cars, trucks, and vans.

The House of Representatives has passed by a very narrow margin a flawed energy bill, flawed with respect to the measurable objective they set in reducing consumption of oil.

But at least they have a measurable objective. And their measurable objective, as I recall, is over roughly another 5 or 6 years to reduce by, I think, 5 billion gallons the amount of oil that we consume. That is in their bill, with respect to our light trucks, vans, SUVs.

If we actually consider how many miles per gallon that equates to, it says we are going to improve our fuel efficiency by maybe a mile or mile and a half per gallon over roughly the next half dozen years. That is not much. That is far too modest a goal and certainly far too modest a goal for the next dozen years.

We are going to stay on this bill for a while longer. I wish very much we could vote for the Kerry-McCain amendment because it has changed a whole lot from what was originally envisioned and, frankly, what has been originally put in this bill, and it has been changed in ways that I think make

sense. I thank them for the changes, including ones I proposed, that they have been willing to accept.

Before we move off this bill, I hope we will come back to this thought; that while it is important that we preserve jobs and while it is important that we provide reasonable lead time for the auto industry, and while it is important that we think outside the box and invest in R&D and tax credits and commercialize the technologies that are coming along--those are all things that are important to do--it is also important for us to reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

For us, today, to think we are going to have to cram into these tiny little cars like the purple people eater that was put on display by Senator Lott earlier is just not the case.

We build Dodge Durangos in my State. They get about 17 miles per gallon. If they introduce a gas hybrid engine, they will increase their fuel efficiency next year by about 30 percent. That is just next year, by 30 percent. There are ways we can use diesel hybrids to increase that 30 percent to something like 60 percent, if the diesel hybrid is able to meet our requirements for tier 2 clean air standards, particularly for nitrogen oxide and particulates. We can do these things and we don't have to sacrifice comfort, we don't have to sacrifice space, we don't have to sacrifice safety in order to have the kind of vehicles people want to buy and want to drive and to be able to remove our country's future from the hands of the folks who control so much of the oil in the world.

My wife has a Ford Explorer. She likes it a lot. It doesn't get very good gas mileage, but she likes it a lot. She likes the size and a lot of things about it. Probably the next car she buys will be a similar vehicle. I drive a Chrysler Town and Country minivan. I like it a lot, and with a young family, it meets our needs. I sure wish it got better gas mileage. I wish it got a lot better gas mileage. We can

do those things.

Senator Kerry mentioned--I will just close with this--when John Kennedy was running for President in 1960, he talked about a goal of putting a man on the Moon, an American on the Moon by the end of that decade. Today, that may not seem to be a very big undertaking, but in 1960 it sure was. The idea we could take a man and put him in a space suit, put him in a missile and send him up to the Moon and let him walk on the Moon and turn around and fly back safely, the idea somebody at the time could do was almost incomprehensible. But he said we could do this as a nation; that we ought to do it before the end of the 1960s. And we did.

If we could do that as a nation four decades ago, we can build cars, trucks, and vans that people want to buy and want to use in this country and at the same time reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

When I filled up the tank of my Chrysler Town and Country minivan in Dover earlier this week, I know some of the \$20 I charged on my credit card to fill that tank is going to people around the world, or will end up in the pockets of people in nations that do not like us very much anymore. They don't have our best interests in mind, necessarily. In some cases, they will use the resources we continue to ship overseas when we purchase the oil--some of them are committed to using the resources we give them against us, to hurt us and hurt our people here and in other places around the world. We should not continue to be so foolish as to do that.

Before we leave this bill and vote on final passage next week, I believe we need to come back and address the issue of clear, measurable objectives and make sure as we go to conference with the House with respect to the use of oil, consumption of oil in our cars, trucks, and vans, that we have put in place some clear, measurable objectives that will reduce our reliance on that foreign oil.